

prepared to work in another way if that is what we need to do to get some balance in the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for his remarks. I extend my appreciation for his strong leadership in developing and bringing to the floor of the Senate the Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 2016.

Specifically, I urge the Senate to do as he suggests. Let's get this bill before the Senate, offer amendments if Senators have suggestions for changes in the bill, and move ahead to completing action on this bill on time so we can predict with some certainty what our obligations are going to be and we can more thoughtfully with a sense of confidence know that we are doing the right thing to protect the security interests of our country, our citizens, and our interests around the world.

We have before us an effort to move to the consideration of the Department of Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 2016. The bill provides \$514.1 billion in base budget funding and \$58.6 billion in overseas contingency operations funding for the Department of Defense.

The Senate Appropriations Committee has worked on a bipartisan basis to write and approve 12 individual appropriations bills this year for the first time since 2009. Senators should have the opportunity to debate, amend, and approve the Defense appropriations bill. The legislation is a bipartisan national security measure that provides the resources that are necessary to protect our Nation, support our servicemembers and their families, and meet current and future threats to our national security.

We have no greater priority than protecting our national security interests here at home and abroad. I urge Senators to cooperate and support our efforts and to vote to proceed to the consideration of this bill. I am hopeful that the leadership can get together and work out a time that is convenient and appropriate for carrying out this responsibility.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2685, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, James M. Inhofe, John Hoeven, John Thune, Lamar Alexander, Richard Burr, Jerry Moran, John Cornyn, James E. Risch, Mike Crapo, Steve Daines, Jeff Flake, Cory Gardner, John Boozman, Thad Cochran, Pat Roberts, David Perdue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2685, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 44, as follows:

#### [Rollcall Vote No. 298 Leg.]

##### YEAS—51

Alexander	Donnelly	Moran
Ayotte	Enzi	Murkowski
Barrasso	Ernst	Paul
Blunt	Fischer	Perdue
Boozman	Flake	Portman
Burr	Gardner	Risch
Capito	Grassley	Roberts
Cassidy	Hatch	Rounds
Coats	Heller	Sasse
Cochran	Hoeven	Scott
Collins	Inhofe	Sessions
Corker	Isakson	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson	Sullivan
Cotton	Kirk	Thune
Crapo	Lankford	Tillis
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Daines	McCain	Wicker

##### NAYS—44

Baldwin	Heitkamp	Nelson
Bennet	Hirono	Peters
Blumenthal	Kaine	Reed
Booker	King	Reid
Brown	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cantwell	Leahy	Schumer
Cardin	Manchin	Shaheen
Carper	Markey	Stabenow
Casey	McCaskill	Tester
Coons	McConnell	Udall
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Feinstein	Merkley	Warren
Franken	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden
Heinrich	Murray	

##### NOT VOTING—5

Boxer	Rubio	Vitter
Graham	Sanders	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 44.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I enter a motion to reconsider the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to the Defense appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

Mr. McCONNELL. I withdraw the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

#### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to H.R. 2029.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 98, H.R. 2029, a bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, for the information of all Senators, there will be a rollcall vote on the motion to proceed to the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill shortly after lunch. The chairman of that committee, Senator KIRK, is working with the ranking member to move that bill across the floor next week. They will have a Senate substitute to the bill pending, and Senators will then further amend. If Senators cooperate in moving things along and scheduling votes on amendments to the bill, we can vote on passage on Tuesday night so that Senators can commemorate Veterans Day back home with their constituents.

Obviously, this is going to require some cooperation from all Members. However, I encourage those Senators with amendments to the MILCON-VA bill to work with Senator KIRK and Senator TESTER to get them in the queue for floor consideration.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

#### STOP SANCTUARY POLICIES AND PROTECT AMERICANS ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, 2 weeks ago, the Senate was unable to proceed to consider a very important piece of legislation called the Stop Sanctuary Policies and Protect Americans Act. The goal of this legislation is to protect our communities from criminals who violate our laws and who pose a danger to those communities—often minority communities themselves. The aim of this legislation is to restore law and order across the country by holding those accountable who are defying Federal law and refusing to cooperate with the Federal Government when it comes to communicating the status of people who are illegally present in the country who have committed other more serious crimes and refusing to honor Federal detainees.

As we discussed the need for this bill, several of my colleagues highlighted the importance of this issue, but unfortunately, we lost that vote because only 54 Senators voted to proceed to the bill and obviously we needed 60 votes.

I am concerned that this debate does not focus on the people harmed the most because of the status quo, and that is why I have come here to the floor to talk about the larger problem of violent crime committed by those who are here illegally and are not being punished according to our laws. I also want to highlight the importance of the victims and families across the country who are suffering because we have not taken the appropriate action to stop these criminals.

There is one person in particular whom I wish to talk about today. My plan is to come to the floor and tell these stories one at a time over the next few weeks.

This is Javier Vega, Jr., who grew up in La Feria, a small town of about 7,000 people in South Texas. Javier was known by the name Harvey to his friends, interestingly enough, and he spent his entire life thinking of ways to help others before himself.

From a young age, he knew he wanted to serve in the military, and so he volunteered for the Marine Corps and embarked on a military career after graduating from La Feria High School. Harvey thrived in the Marine Corps. So after leaving the Marines and working day and night to put himself through college, he decided the next step in his public service was to join the U.S. Border Patrol.

Harvey's mother said that he approached his work at the Border Patrol just like everything else he pursued in life—with diligence, dedication to hard work, and trying just simply to be the best he could be. He was proud to help protect his fellow neighbors and serve our country, and he worked tirelessly to do so.

But, tragically, Harvey's service to his country was cut short. Last summer he was out at one of his favorite fishing spots with his family. He loved fishing. It was a family tradition, and Harvey wanted to pass along his love for this pastime to his sons. Shortly after he and his family members cast their lines into the water on that Sunday afternoon, he was ambushed by two men who tried to rob him, and, heartbreakingly, the encounter turned violent.

Harvey's lifelong commitment to protecting those around him—something he seemed born to do—kicked in instantly. As Harvey and his father, and eventually his mother, tried to fend off the attackers, tragically Javier "Harvey" Vega, Jr., was killed. His father, Javier senior, was shot in the hip and still suffers from the wounds inflicted that afternoon.

This was supposed to be another normal weekend fishing with the family. But instead, this normal weekend—or

what was supposed to be a normal weekend of fishing for Javier and his family—turned deadly.

Who were the killers? They were two illegal immigrant criminals who had repeatedly violated our laws, and by that I don't mean they just entered the country without the appropriate visa. Both had been deported multiple times but managed to repeatedly find their way back into the country, even after committing a long list of crimes.

In fact, according to some witnesses, these two men had been terrorizing the community for months, committing armed robberies and carjackings, and, clearly, they were capable of attacking and killing a hard-working father on a fishing trip with his family.

This is a difficult topic for some because some people would like to mischaracterize what we are trying to do with this legislation as somehow being anti-immigrant. But indeed, legal immigrants and people who live in the communities along South Texas—many of them have had family members come here from Mexico and elsewhere over the years—recognize how much people who illegally enter the country and commit multiple crimes can terrorize communities and victimize the very people whom those who block this legislation say they want to protect.

I don't raise this issue or this story lightly, but the country should know that for the family of Javier Vega, Jr., this is their reality. Illegal immigrant criminals who were deported multiple times attacked them and killed their son—their father, their brother, and their friend. Their lives will never be the same.

A number of our colleagues voted to block our ability to even consider this important legislation that seeks to merely enforce existing Federal law and to defund those jurisdictions that defy Federal law, and this is the consequence of doing nothing—people like Javier Vega, Jr., being victimized by criminals who violate our laws over and over and over, and when we catch them and they are deported, they simply come back into the country and victimize more people and more communities and kill people like Javier Vega, Jr.

The lives of the Vega family will never be the same, and I know they don't want other families in Texas or elsewhere around the country to have to suffer like they have suffered.

It doesn't seem like a lot to ask—that our Federal laws be enforced to protect our communities from criminals. That is all the legislation attempted to do. Yet there was a concerted effort across the aisle to filibuster the bill and prevent us from even considering this legislation, along with any suggestions our colleagues might have for improving it.

The goal of the bill, the Stop Sanctuary Policies and Protect Americans Act, is not to keep legal immigrants from entering the United States or to

disparage law-abiding immigrants. Even the victim's mother, Marie, someone with justifiable, personal anger, noted that this tragedy does not mean that her family is against immigration—far from it. This legislation is narrowly targeted to address the root cause of the tragedies like the one I have been talking about, by targeting criminal illegal immigrants who repeatedly ignored the rule of law and who live with virtual impunity in our country and victimize people like the Vega family.

We can't, in good faith, address immigration reform until the American people see us doing more to enforce our existing laws. I have been here for a while, and I have heard the arguments across the aisle that our colleagues would say: Well, the only thing we need to do to fix problems like what the Vega family experienced and otherwise is to pass comprehensive immigration reform. But the American people simply don't have enough confidence in us if we are unwilling to take the necessary steps to see that the laws on the books are already enforced—the very laws that would protect people like Javier Vega, Jr., and his family.

We have a lot of work to do to regain the public's confidence, because we can do other things that I believe we need to do to fix our broken immigration system. It is imperative, it is our responsibility, and it is something we referred to in our oath—that we will uphold and defend the laws and the Constitution of the United States. It is our responsibility to make sure that local governments comply with Federal laws and do not prevent the Department of Homeland Security from doing its job in enforcing them.

America's law enforcement community, including heroes like Harvey, put their lives on the line every day to protect our citizens. They work tirelessly to try to protect our safety.

I hope our colleagues will come to their senses and stand up for those who provide for our public safety and not contribute to a situation where other families, such as the Vega family, will lose a loved one to the sort of career criminals whom I was referring to earlier who killed Javier Vega, Jr.

I have recently joined with Congressman FILEMON VELA to send a letter to the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection requesting that they reclassify the death of Javier Vega, Jr., as a line-of-duty fatality. Everybody in law enforcement knows that you are never truly off duty, and Javier's brave actions that fateful day back in 2014 should be classified as a death occurring in the line of duty, just like every other law enforcement officer.

I look forward to hearing back from the Commissioner on this soon. I am thankful to Paul Perez, president of the National Border Patrol Council in Kingsville, and to the Rio Grande Valley Union of the National Border Patrol Council for helping the Vega family highlight this issue.

We have a duty to help our brave men and women in law enforcement do their job by passing this legislation and to regain some of the lost confidence the American people used to have in our ability to actually do our job and to keep illegal immigrant criminals and repeat offenders off our streets.

This issue is not going away. There are countless other stories in Texas and across the country, such as the story of Kate Steinle, out in San Francisco, who tragically was murdered by the same sort of repeat illegal immigrant criminal who killed Harvey Vega.

There are a lot more stories to tell—a lot more stories that I hope we will tell in the coming days. It is our duty as Members of Congress to put a stop to this, and I pledge to keep fighting on behalf of the Vega family for legislation that will do just that.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

(The remarks of Mr. KAINE pertaining to the introduction of S. 2256 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are not in a quorum call.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, do I have a limitation on speaking time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no limitation.

Mr. COATS. I thank the Chair.

#### WASTE OF THE WEEK

Madam President, this is my weekly "Waste of the Week" speech. It is time for another one.

Let me just say up front this involves Department of Defense spending. Now, I am a strong advocate. I am an Army veteran. I have served on the Senate Armed Services Committee for nearly two terms. I am a strong advocate of a strong national defense, but it doesn't mean we give a blank check to the Department of Defense. It means we have to scrutinize their expenditures and their engagement in spending taxpayers' dollars just as carefully as we scrutinize every other agency. Everybody is involved in terms of finding the best and most effective way of using taxpayer dollars, hopefully without going into debt to do so and hopefully directed to those issues of priority and necessity that we have to fund. The Department of Defense of course is one of those. Although, as I said, it doesn't mean they get a blank check.

I am deeply disappointed that my Democratic friends across the aisle have denied us the opportunity to take up the Department of Defense appropriations bill, where we would have the opportunity to offer amendments to strike money or to save money that could be used for essential, necessary

efforts in spending by the Department of Defense.

Clearly every agency has to do some triage if we are ever going to get control of our out-of-control budget and our out-of-control plunge into deficit spending year after year, with the debt ever growing. I just heard today that we are now at \$18.5 trillion in debt, and that is going to come back to haunt us in future generations.

So the triage involves defining what is essential. Is this an essential expenditure that only the Federal Government can make? Defense spending falls into that category; that is, something that we can't leave to the States. Secondly, there is a lot we would like to do that may be necessary but is not urgent, a priority, or essential—when we have the money to do it. The third category is, Why in the world are you doing that in the first place? How can we define those items that are not necessary and take those funds and use them? Either give them back to the taxpayer or put them toward something that is essential rather than continuing to raise the funding, keeping all of the "why we are we doing this in the first place?" stuff funded year after year. We are not being given the opportunity to do that.

It is beyond this Senator's comprehension that, having established the caps with the agreement that passed last week—which I couldn't vote for because it kept adding more to our debt and didn't fully address the real problem of entitlement spending. But nevertheless, the decision was made, and we had to pass it. Now it is simply a process of allocating the money within the limits of how much can be spent. That is what we are supposed to be able to do, of course, in committee.

We are also supposed to have the opportunity as Members of the Senate to bring forward amendments, to bring forward policy issues, to debate on the floor, and hopefully to improve the bill, making it better, more cost effective, and efficient.

OK. Here we go—waste of the week. I think this is the 20th-something time I have been on this floor during this year. Every week the Senate is in session, I come and do the waste of the week. This week it addresses, as I said, the Department of Defense. I want to highlight what a recent inspector general Department of Defense report found: over \$40 million of overspending by the Department of Defense to build one gas station in Afghanistan.

The special inspector general for Afghanistan reconstruction found that the Department of Defense Task Force for Stability and Business Operations actually spent \$43 million on a single natural gas fueling station in Afghanistan. The station was originally projected to cost \$3 million—and we will talk about how ever got to \$3 million, let alone how in the world this could have gotten to a total of \$43 million.

According to the IG report, DOD spent this money "to fund the con-

struction and to supervise the initial operation of the station. Specifically, it spent approximately \$12.3 million in direct costs"—I guess that was building the station—"and \$30 million in overhead costs."

We are digging in to find out what those overhead costs were, but somebody came away with a pretty good profit margin just by submitting bills for \$30 million in overhead costs which apparently were approved and spent and given to the contractors.

To make matters worse, the inspector general's office found that the reasons the gas station needed to be built in the first place were not legitimate. They said there is zero evidence that the Department of Defense conducted the prior research necessary to identify potential obstacles before initiating this \$43 million project. Wouldn't you think somebody would have said: Wait a minute. What is this for? Where is it going to be? How much is it going to cost? Is it worth it? What is the projected spending? Is it going to be worth doing this? Does it make any sense? The IG office said there was zero evidence in the DOD's research that there could be a potential obstacle in going forward with this. One of those obstacles is Afghanistan doesn't have the pipeline infrastructure to get the gas to the gas station. Another key obstacle is that on average it would cost more to convert a vehicle in Afghanistan to use compressed natural gas than the average Afghan earns in a single year. What all this means is that the Department of Defense built a gas station that doesn't consistently have gas or customers, all for \$43 million.

Most outrageously, the original \$3 million allocated to this project was over and above the international norm for building this kind of compressed natural gas station. The International Energy Agency analyzed global construction costs for similar fueling stations and found that construction costs ranged from \$200,000 to \$500,000 per station. It did acknowledge that in non-industrialized countries such as Afghanistan, costs would be on the high-end. OK. The high-end is \$500,000. It still raises the question, If nobody is going to use it or we can't get gas to the station to put into the vehicles, why are we doing this in the first place? It also raises the question, Why did it cost \$3 million in projected construction costs when the average high-end is \$500,000 per station in places like Afghanistan? What do you get for \$3 million? What they say you get for \$3 million ended up costing \$12 million, and then the final bill is \$43 million. What do you get?

As you can see on this photograph, you get one of these out in the desert in Afghanistan. It is a little bit blurry. There is the structure. You have some pumps here. They actually did want to prove that some cars use this, so there are a couple of vehicles pictured out there in the desert. There is a telephone pole, I guess, out there. You can

see we are not talking about the mid-  
dle of a city.

So that is what you get. That is what you get, folks, for \$43 million of expenditures. This is almost beyond the pale. It is almost something that you come down here and say: This can't be true. You can't make this stuff up. This is an example, though, I am afraid, of a lot of other overspending which we are going to dive into. But this one example alone illustrates that someone is making some very bad decisions and that taxpayers' dollars were not, at the least, properly stewarded by someone.

American taxpayers deserve an answer to this fraud, to this waste. Why did we pay \$43 million to build this gas station when there was no research justifying building it in the first place? They want an explanation of why this particular project was \$40 million over budget, and even the budgeted price was significantly higher—8 to 10 times higher—than the projected average cost of building something like this in a third-world country. Taxpayers need an explanation of how and why this could have ever happened, and there needs to be a full investigation. We need and will demand answers.

What has been illustrated is a perfect example of why not only my constituents but the American public feels that Washington can no longer be trusted and that no one in Washington gets it. Well, I get it. I get it, and we ought to all get it. We ought to be just as outraged as our constituents in terms of our performance here. This is totally unacceptable.

As has been said, this Senator is one of the biggest supporters of a strong national defense as anyone standing on this Senate floor, but we are weakening our defense and not allocating our money to the essentials that we need to support our soldiers in the essential tasks they have and the equipment they need. We are doing this kind of stuff, and it has to stop.

Our waste of the week is now totaling over \$117 billion of identified waste, and who knows what the total would be if we could comb through every agency. Our former colleague Tom Coburn used to say there is a good \$1 trillion if added all up. I don't know if it reaches that or not, but we are well on the way. We are at \$117 trillion, and these are the things I have identified and addressed coming to the floor this year.

Hopefully my colleagues will pay attention. We can't get the big things done. The President won't sign anything or engage in anything relative to the real gorilla in the room that is going to take us down economically, which are the runaway entitlements. Despite all the efforts, many of them bipartisan, the President has said: No, no, no, no, no, not on my watch.

The spending is continuing to go up, but the least we can do until we get somebody more responsible as our leader in the White House and until we have the will and courage to take on

what we all know needs to be done to get our fiscal house back in order—in the meantime, we can at least stop this egregious spending and waste of taxpayer dollars through fraud and abuse.

I am going to continue to do this. Next week we have lined up in our office what we will do, coming down virtually every day to do this and not run out of examples of how taxpayers' dollars are being wasted.

As you can tell, I am getting worked up about all this. Somebody needs to get worked up about this because it is not happening and we are spending money, and the public has given up and thrown up their hands and said we are dysfunctional, and they are right.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UDALL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. UDALL and Mr. HEINRICH pertaining to the introduction of S. 2254 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. HEINRICH. Madam President, I yield to my colleague from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

#### TRIBUTE TO AMY JISHI

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, I rise to recognize the heroic efforts of Amy Jishi, a Michigander who serves as a transportation security inspector at Detroit Metropolitan International Airport. I just spoke to her a few moments ago on the phone and thanked her for her brave actions.

Recently, while leaving work at the airport Amy observed an accident at a traffic light. She noticed that one of the cars was leaking gasoline and a fire had started underneath it. Without hesitation, Amy selflessly placed herself in harm's way to offer assistance and to warn others about the fire, and she worked to free the driver from the vehicle, despite a stuck door, and was able to free him shortly before the car burst into flames. Afterwards, Amy told a reporter, "When I saw the accident, the only thought that went through my mind was to help them."

Amy is a lifelong resident of Dearborn Heights and has worked with the Transportation Security Administration in Detroit for 8 years. She and her TSA colleagues across the Nation work to keep the American people and the traveling public safe each and every day.

As a member of the Senate Homeland Security committee, it is a privilege to hear the stories of the men and women at the Department of Homeland Security who work around the clock and around the world to keep our country safe. These individuals are dedicated to

public service and are willing to put Americans' safety and well-being above their own, and they deserve the recognition, as well as the resources and policies that will continue to position them for success in the mission they take so seriously and personally.

I would like to recognize Amy's selfless action, quick thinking, and dedication to her fellow Americans. Because of her actions, a young driver was able to walk away from what would have been a terrible tragedy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

#### SAVE BENEFITS ACT

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, exactly 3 weeks ago the Social Security Administration made a very quiet announcement. Next year, for just the third time since 1975, seniors who receive Social Security won't be getting an annual cost-of-living increase.

Two-thirds of seniors depend on Social Security for the majority of their income. For 15 million Americans, Social Security is all that stands between them and poverty. But not one of these Americans—not one—will see an extra dime next year. Millions of other Americans whose benefits are pegged to Social Security—millions who receive veterans' benefits, disability benefits, and other monthly payments—won't see an extra dime either.

These are tough times—but not for everyone. According to most recent data from the Economic Policy Institute, CEOs at the top 350 American companies received on average a 3.9-percent pay increase last year. That is a lot of money because the average CEO pay at one of the top 350 American companies was a cool \$16.3 million in 2014. On average, they got more than half a million dollars each in pay raises. So CEOs get huge pay raises while seniors, veterans, and others who have worked hard—70 million of them—will get nothing. Why? It is not an accident; it is the result of deliberate policies set right here in Congress.

Social Security is supposed to be indexed to inflation so that when prices go up, benefits will go up, too. But Congress's formula looks at the spending habits of only about a quarter of the country, and the formula isn't geared to what older Americans actually spend. Projections for costs of core goods and services, projections that remove the components of prices that are the most uncertain and erratic, show that inflation is up about 2 percent, but seniors, who usually get a boost on January 1, won't see an extra dime next year, mostly because of falling gasoline prices, which just don't mean as much to millions of seniors who don't commute to work. Meanwhile, seniors who are trying to cover things such as rent and exploding prescription drug prices are left out in the cold. It is all Federal policy.

What about those huge CEO bonuses? They are also the consequence, in part,

of congressional policy. A report released just last week from the Center for Effective Government and the Institute for Policy Studies details how taxpayers subsidized CEOs' huge pay packages through billions of dollars in giveaways, including subsidies such as special tax-deferred compensation accounts and a crazy loophole that allows corporations to write off obscene bonuses as a business expense.

Companies can make their own decisions on how much to compensate their executives, but because of the laws Congress has passed, American taxpayers are forced to subsidize these multimillion-dollar pay packages.

It is time for Congress to make different choices. If we do nothing, on January 1 more than 70 million seniors, veterans, and other Americans won't get an extra dime. While Congress sits on its hands and pretends there is nothing we can do for seniors or vets, while Congress claims there just isn't any money to fix the problem, American taxpayers will keep right on subsidizing billions of dollars' worth of bonuses for highly paid CEOs. It is a choice. Congress can spend taxpayer money subsidizing billions of dollars for bonuses for corporate executives or Congress can use that very same money to help 70 million people who live on Social Security, veterans' benefits, and disability payments. Congress makes the choice.

That is why I am here today, along with a number of my colleagues, to introduce the Senior and Veterans Emergency Benefits Act. The SAVE Benefits Act will give seniors on Social Security, veterans, those with disabilities, and others a one-time payment equivalent to an average increase of 3.9 percent—the same tax-subsidized pay increase top CEOs received last year.

We can increase pay for seniors and vets without adding a single penny to the deficit simply by closing one of the many tax loopholes that subsidize these giant pay packages for executives. In fact, according to the Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration, closing this loophole will create enough revenue to help seniors and vets and there will still be enough money left over to help extend the life of the Social Security trust fund. This should be a bipartisan act. Nobody wants to see seniors struggle to pay their grocery and utility bills. Everybody should want to extend the life of Social Security.

Both Democrats and Republicans have expressed contempt for this tax loophole. Back in 1993, Congress passed section 162(m)—a Tax Code provision designed to rein in excessive corporate compensation—but the provision includes so many loopholes, most corporations just get around them. In fact, in 2006 Republican Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY said that “sophisticated folks are working with Swiss-watch-like devices to game this Swiss-cheese-like rule.” In 2009 Republican Senator JOHN MCCAIN and Democratic Senator

Carl Levin introduced a bill to shut down access to this loophole for corporate stock options. Just last year, the Republican chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee included reform of this loophole as part of his flagship tax reform bill. So let's just do it. Let's close the loophole, and let's use the money to give seniors and vets the support they need.

Think about what this change would mean. That 3.9 percent is worth about \$581 a year, a little less than \$50 a month. I know that is a rounding error for those top corporate executives who are pulling in an average of over \$16 million each. But Social Security payments average only about \$1,250 a month, and millions of seniors who rely on those checks are barely scraping by. A \$581 increase could cover almost 3 months of groceries for seniors or a year's worth of out-of-pocket costs on critical prescription drugs for Medicare beneficiaries. That \$50 a month is worth a heck of a lot to the 70 million Americans who would have just a little more in their pockets as a result of this bill. In fact, according to an analysis from the Economic Policy Institute, that little boost could lift more than a million people out of poverty.

We all know someone who lives on Social Security—every single one of us. We know family members, a friend, a neighbor, people who worked hard all their lives and who now rely on Social Security checks to get by. Giving seniors a little help with their Social Security and stitching up these corporate tax write-offs isn't just about economics; it is about our values. For too long we have listened to a handful of powerful folks who have had one message: Cut taxes for those at the top, cut rules and regulations that keep businesses honest, and let everybody else fight over the scraps. We have tried that approach, and now we have a retirement crisis. Guaranteed pensions are gone, and 401(k)s and IRAs have been decimated by the stock market. Fewer and fewer people can afford to save for the future. We tried it, and it was a complete failure.

These same powerful folks will tell you there is nothing we can do to help 70 million seniors, veterans, Americans with disabilities, and others who will not see an extra dime this year. They will say we can't afford it. They will say we can't do anything to expand Social Security. They will say we need to gut Social Security in order to save it. They will say all of this, exactly at the same moment that we continue to shovel billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies out the door for corporations to boost pay to their highest paid executives.

That is the problem. The money is there, only right now it goes to a handful of CEOs because that is where the law written by Congress sends it. But Congress can make a different choice—a choice that reflects our deepest values, a choice to give a boost to 70 million Americans who have earned one, a

choice to lift over 1 million people out of poverty, and a choice to extend the life of Social Security. It is all about choices—millionaire and billionaire CEOs or retirees, vets, and disabled Americans.

I ask my colleagues to support the SAVE Benefits Act. January 1 will be here soon, and we need to make a choice now.

Madam President, I yield to my colleague from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

We spend a lot of time here on the floor of the Senate talking about how our States are different. That happens in the House of Representatives where I served as well. But there is one thing that certainly unites all of our States and, frankly, one thing that unites all of the front desks of our Senate offices, and that is this: We have all been flooded with phone calls from the thousands upon thousands of constituents in each one of our districts who are furious that they are going to get no increase in Social Security at the beginning of next year. Despite the fact that prices for virtually everything that fixed income seniors are paying for are going up, they are getting absolutely nothing to try to compensate them for those cost of living increases.

We are hearing from people like Kevin in Bridgeport, who said:

Dear Senator Murphy, I am a lifelong resident of Bridgeport. . . . I am 63 years old . . . living on SSDI due to a rare disease of the spinal cord. . . . Since my only source of income is SSDI, I am concerned about the recent announcement that there is going to be no COLA increase for 2016. If there is anything you can do to reverse this decision, millions of Americans like myself would be greatly helped and greatly appreciative.

Or there is Fred from Wolcott, who said:

I understand the lower gas prices have kept the CPI lower with the result [being] no [Social Security] increase in 2016. Many of us do not drive or drive a limited amount and the lower gas prices do not place additional funds in our pocket.

Meanwhile, the cost of beef, chicken, eggs and milk etc., the things we live on have risen, and have reduced our purchasing power. Many on Social Security have no other form of income.

Adeline of New Fairfield, CT, says:

My husband and I were very disappointed that we did not receive our cost of living raise in our check. . . . Please let that be the last time. With all the medical deductibles and food and clothes and taxes going up, it gets discouraging. . . . We are up in age and not in the best of health and because of that we are unable to get a job. [Social Security is what we depend on.]

These stories can be multiplied millions of times over, and all over our districts. What are we going to do about it? Are we going to sit here, as we do with issue after issue, and offer no response to the millions of our constituents who are telling us that they are going to have trouble making ends meet? Or are we going to make a

choice? Are we going to make a choice to end an unjustifiable loophole that allows corporations to hand over millions of dollars to their CEOs virtually tax-free or are we going to invest in the millions of seniors and disabled across this country who are going to have a hard time living and making ends meet if we don't make the change involved in the piece of legislation that we are announcing today? The SAVE Benefits Act is going to save the lives of seniors who without a cost of living increase are going to have trouble affording medication and food. It really comes at no cost to the corporations that are right now receiving an unjustifiable tax benefit—one that Congress really never intended.

Congress passed and has accepted as part of our tax law for 20 years this provision that doesn't allow companies to take a tax benefit for salaries over \$1 million. It is not surprising that companies found a way around that provision because it exempted performance-based pay. So bonuses and stock options could be handed over with full tax benefit, and that became the standard for compensation packages. All of a sudden it wasn't about salary any longer, and it became about this performance-based pay.

You live in a world today in which there is this perverse system—the more corporations pay their CEOs, the lower their tax bill is.

It is not going to hurt corporations to simply have to pay taxes on the bonuses above \$1 million that they send to their CEOs and big executives. They are going to continue paying their CEOs a lot of money. A lot of them live in Connecticut. I don't have any fear that there is going to be a rapid diminution in the amount of money that CEOs are making, but at least those companies will pay taxes on those exorbitant salaries. We will be able to use that money to make sure that their customers—the people who are buying the goods that these big companies make—actually have the purchasing power with which to enter and be active in the economy.

I guess that is the piece of economics that I will end on here. By putting \$50 more a month into the hands of frail, poor seniors and disabled, you are providing an enormous economic benefit to the economy, because all of that money is going to go into the economy.

Let me tell you what a senior living at or below the poverty line is going to do with \$50 a month. They are going to put it into food. They are going to put it into medicine. They are going to put it into Main Street businesses. The fact is that when you decide instead to subsidize salaries of above \$1 million, that money isn't going back into the Main Street economy. Maybe a portion of it is, but a lot of it is ending up in giant accrued pensions and savings accounts or in offshore investments—not in the Main Street economy.

This is not just the right thing to do for these seniors who are crying out to

every single one of our offices to do something about this unjustifiable lack of a COLA, but it is the right thing to do for the economy at large because the money is going to find its way into all sorts of crevices and corners of this economy that badly need that kind of infusion.

I wish to thank Senator WARREN for introducing this legislation. I wanted to come down to the floor to lend my voice to it and for it on behalf of the hundreds and hundreds of seniors in Connecticut who are contacting and calling our office asking for the Senate to do something.

With that, let me yield to my colleague and friend from Connecticut, Senator BLUMENTHAL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I am grateful to my colleague and friend from Connecticut for quoting some of the literally hundreds of letters that both of our offices have been receiving from Social Security recipients and also from veterans in my State. I suspect my colleagues from Massachusetts have been receiving the same letters. I want to thank Senator WARREN for her leadership on this issue but also Senator REED, who joined me some years ago in seeking to close the loophole that is fundamentally undermining not only the fairness but the effectiveness of our Tax Code.

Let's understand what this loophole means to us as taxpayers. The performance pay loophole means that effectively unlimited corporate tax deductions are provided for executive pay. Put aside the issue of whether this pay makes sense or is fair, whether you agree or disagree with these gargantuan amounts. Who should pay for those extraordinary amounts of compensation? This loophole means that you and I as taxpayers are the ones who shoulder at least part of the burden. We do it because the money lost to the Federal Government as a result of this tax deduction must somehow be gained in some other way. Guess where it comes from. It comes from you and me—not from those corporations that can deduct it. It comes from you and me.

Senator REED and I have sought over the years to close this loophole to make sure that the tax-deferred compensation for corporate executives and the performance pay loophole are effectively closed and the Tax Code is made fair. But Senator WARREN has introduced a new and profoundly important element to this fight. And that is this: How should we use the proceeds from closing this loophole? The answer is this: In recognition of the reality that current economic burdens are falling hardest on people who least can afford them—seniors, veterans, and families who depend entirely or in significant part on benefits through Social Security and the VA—should be given the benefit of closing this loophole. Why? First of all, because it is the right thing to do.

The current measures of the cost of living fail to measure the cost of living for them. That is because we don't all buy the same thing. The index or the formula that is used to calculate costs-of-living increases fail to measure the real economic burden on certain groups, namely our seniors and our veterans. You have heard very eloquently and powerfully from my colleagues, from Senator WARREN and Senator MURPHY, about the impact on our Social Security recipients.

I am here as the ranking member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee to say that those benefits affect 25,000 veterans in Connecticut who receive VA compensation for a service-connected disability, more than 2,000 survivors or dependent children who receive VA compensation, and 4.3 million veteran beneficiaries nationwide. They earned their benefits through their sacrifice and service to this country.

This issue is about keeping faith with our veterans and making sure we leave no veteran behind. They earned those benefits through their service as well as sacrifice—sometimes unimaginable sacrifice. They earned those benefits through injury and wounds on the battlefield, and those benefits are necessary to ensure a smooth transition into civilian life for service-disabled veterans and their families who often face enormous and staggering additional costs and a reduced ability to work.

To ensure that these vital benefits correspond to the actual cost of food, housing, clothing, gas, and other basic elements of daily life, the VA is authorized to adjust them—adjust them for inflation—and the index they use is the one that Social Security relies on as well. That is the connection to veterans. And that volatile formula, as I have said, too often fails to reflect the actual cost of living for this group of people, leaving millions of our veterans, as well as our seniors, without a realistic chance to keep pace.

Our disabled veterans deserve better. It is that simple. They deserve better than what is happening to them right now. They deserve real compensation that recognizes rising real-world costs, escalating living expenses that are painfully squeezing them, as well as our seniors, and they deserve a fair raise and a fair choice.

I urge my colleagues to join with us. Close this loophole, make the Tax Code fairer to all taxpayers, and also make sure our seniors and veterans get what they need and deserve, to live with the basic necessities that are essential to them. We need to keep faith with our veterans and make sure the greatest Nation in the world recognizes the greatest of its heroes, our veterans.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor to my colleague and great friend from Hawaii, Senator HIRONO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.



Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, last month the Social Security Administration announced some disappointing news. For only the third time in 40 years Social Security beneficiaries will not receive a cost-of-living or COLA increase in January 2016.

In Hawaii, one out of four seniors relies on Social Security as their only source of income. They are struggling to keep a roof over their heads, pay for medicine, and buy groceries—basic necessities. Many Hawaii seniors have told me their stories about how costs for essential goods keep rising while the Social Security checks do not.

Meanwhile, by contrast—and we heard this from my esteemed colleague the Senator from Massachusetts—the CEOs of the wealthiest companies in America are doing great. The average CEO at America's top 350 companies saw a raise of 3.9 percent just last year. Since the economic recovery of 2009, these CEOs have seen their pay increase by a whopping 54.3 percent. I have nothing against hard-working people, including CEOs, getting a raise. If CEOs came up with a good idea and they are managing a successful company, that is great for them, their companies, and one hopes for the company's employees, but did you know taxpayers are partly footing the bill for CEO pay raises?

The Tax Code today has a “performance pay” loophole that provides tax subsidies for high-level corporate executive compensation packages. That is why I am proud to join Senator WARREN and others in introducing the SAVE Benefits Act. Our bill would provide a modest cost-of-living increase next year, the same 3.9 percent increase our Nation's top CEOs received this year. This would mean an average payment increase of about \$580 for our seniors. This is money that makes a huge difference to all of our seniors. This one-time COLA payment would also apply to veterans' benefits—as my colleague RICHARD BLUMENTHAL just focused upon—Federal disability insurance, and equivalent State or local retirement programs. To pay for this one-time COLA, our bill would close the tax giveaways to the wealthiest CEOs. Closing the performance pay loophole is a bipartisan idea, even supported by the former chair of the House Committee on Ways and Means in his tax reform proposal.

In the long run, we should also modernize the formula Social Security uses to calculate COLAs each year, and that is why I introduced the Protecting and Preserving Social Security Act, which would base COLAs on a more accurate formula of what seniors actually buy, the Consumer Price Index for the Elderly or CPI-E. The CPI-E gives more weight to items seniors actually buy, such as medicine, housing, and home energy costs rather than electronics or clothing that younger workers buy more of. My bill would pay for the CPI-E by requiring millionaires and billionaires to pay the same rate into the So-

cial Security trust fund that everybody else pays year-round. Otherwise, under the current law, once workers earn more than \$118,500 in the year, they stop paying the payroll taxes that support the Social Security trust fund.

I was on the Senate floor last month and shared the story of one of my constituents from with Wahiawa, and it bears repeating. She wrote to me recently and said:

I find it incredible that there are people who actually believe that Social Security is too generous. The average Social Security benefit is a whopping \$14,000 a year, and we've only seen an average 2 percent COLA over the past five years. I can assure you my health care costs have far exceeded that tiny increase.

Congress needs to listen to seniors like her and act to provide this modest one-time increase to help seniors make ends meet in 2016 and to change the way COLA is calculated. I urge my colleagues to join me in letting seniors in Hawaii and seniors all across the country have this one-time boost to their Social Security payments.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the SAVE Benefits Act as well as the Protecting and Preserving Social Security Act.

I yield the floor to my colleague from Massachusetts, Senator MARKEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Hawaii for her eloquent statement on this very important issue, and I thank the Senator from Massachusetts Senator WARREN for once again, as usual, putting her finger right on the heart of a huge issue in our country.

We have seniors, veterans, and SSI recipients across our country who will receive zero this year in terms of an increase in their benefits that they have so rightly earned by their service to our country. What Senator WARREN is essentially saying is, Who really built this country? Who made this great country the place that we live in today? The truth is grandma and grandpa built this country. Grandma and grandpa got up every single day, went to work, built this incredible economy, and now that they are in retirement, grandma and grandpa are being told for the next year they don't get a raise. They don't get anything. They don't get a cost-of-living adjustment. They don't get any increase at all. They built this country. The veterans who are seniors, they protected this country. The veterans who are disabled, they built this country, they protected this country.

What Senator WARREN has done so accurately is essentially point out that there was a big loophole in our laws, and that loophole is a corporate compensation loophole that allows unlimited corporate deductions for executive performance pay.

What have we learned over the last 20 years in America? The rich are getting richer, but the people at the bottom

are not. All this bill says, quite simply, is, Let's have the raise go to the seniors for 1 year. Let's have the raise go to grandma and grandpa. Let's give them a reward for the incredible benefits that have been flowing disproportionately to the upper 1 percentile. Let's give them the 3.9-percent raise. Let's give them the kind of comfort and thanks they deserve for all of their hard work.

What happens too often in Congress is that grandma and grandpa just get forgotten. There is a constant debate over whether grandma and grandpa are getting too much in Medicare, too much in Medicaid, and too much in Social Security benefits. “We must solve that problem,” say too many people here and around the country.

No, grandma and grandpa are not the problem. By their hard work every single day for their entire lives, by getting up, going to work, and creating these great families who make us the greatest country on the planet, they are the ones who created this incredible wealth that we have in our society.

I think we all owe an enormous debt of gratitude to Senator WARREN because she has found a quite brilliant way to frame this debate on the Senate floor and for our country because it really does force us to all step back and ask the question of who contributed the most to our country over the last generation—a small handful of people at the top or everyone in the country who got up every single day who are the people we now call grandma and grandpa. I don't think we should be shortchanging them. I think Senator WARREN's bill is the right way to solve that problem in order to make sure they get what they deserve. I thank Senator WARREN for her great leadership on this issue.

I yield to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, I want to speak on the MILCON-VA bill. We have 1 minute. We are going to take a giant leap of faith that the majority is going to do the right thing by our veterans and by this country. I will vote to proceed on this bill with the hope that Members of this body are finally ready to honor our commitment we made to the veterans of this country.

As everyone knows, for most of the year, the Senate Appropriations Committee was crafting appropriations bills that fit under disastrous spending caps put forward by the majority's budget resolution. As a member of the VA appropriations subcommittee, I was especially concerned that because of the budget resolution, we were underfunding the VA by over \$850 million. This shortchange to our veterans would have been a disgrace.

Back in May when I introduced an amendment in the committee to provide an additional \$857 million to the VA—\$857 million the VA needs to do its job—every Republican on the Appropriations Committee voted against my

amendment. I find it troubling that there are some so quick to send our troops into harm's way but neglect them when they return from war. That is exactly what happened, and we saw an appropriations bill that underfunded veterans health.

The good news is that under the budget agreement we voted on this last week, that Senators in this body supported, we are going to fix the problem. It is now time to show the American people that we can govern responsibly by standing up for our veterans.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I know of no further debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2029.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 299 Leg.]

#### YEAS—93

Alexander	Feinstein	Murphy
Ayotte	Fischer	Murray
Baldwin	Flake	Nelson
Barrasso	Franken	Paul
Bennet	Gardner	Perdue
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Peters
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Booker	Hatch	Reed
Boozman	Heinrich	Reid
Brown	Heitkamp	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Cantwell	Hirono	Rounds
Capito	Hoeven	Sasse
Cardin	Inhofe	Schatz
Carper	Isakson	Schumer
Casey	Johnson	Scott
Cassidy	Kaine	Sessions
Coats	King	Shaheen
Cochran	Kirk	Shelby
Collins	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coons	Lankford	Sullivan
Corker	Leahy	Tester
Cornyn	Lee	Thune
Cotton	Manchin	Tillis
Crapo	Markey	Toomey
Cruz	McCaín	Udall
Daines	McCaskill	Warner
Donnelly	McConnell	Warren
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Enzi	Mikulski	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Wyden

#### NOT VOTING—7

Boxer	Moran	Vitter
Graham	Rubio	
Merkley	Sanders	

The motion was agreed to.

#### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business. The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2029) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

*That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, namely:*

#### TITLE I

##### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

##### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

*For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Army as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Army Corps of Engineers and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, and for construction and operation of facilities in support of the functions of the Commander in Chief, \$663,245,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: Provided, That, of this amount, not to exceed \$109,245,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, and host nation support, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of the Army determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.*

##### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

*For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, facilities, and real property for the Navy and Marine Corps as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$1,619,699,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: Provided, That, of this amount, not to exceed \$91,649,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of the Navy determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.*

##### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

*For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Air Force as currently authorized by law, \$1,389,185,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: Provided, That, of this amount, not to exceed \$89,164,000 shall be*

*available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Air Force determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.*

##### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

*For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, installations, facilities, and real property for activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as currently authorized by law, \$2,290,767,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: Provided, That such amounts of this appropriation as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to such appropriations of the Department of Defense available for military construction or family housing as the Secretary may designate, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: Provided further, That, of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$160,404,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.*

##### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

*For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$197,237,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: Provided, That, of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$20,337,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Director of the Army National Guard determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.*

##### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

*For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$138,738,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: Provided, That, of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$5,104,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Director of the Air National Guard determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the determination and the reasons therefor.*

##### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

*For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army Reserve as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$113,595,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020: Provided, That, of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$9,318,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Chief of the Army Reserve determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the*